

**REMARKS**

Claims 9, 12 and 13 have been amended to correct a minor objection noted by the Examiner. Applicant submits entry of this amendment is proper in order to correct the noted objection and place the claims in better form for appeal.

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Shima in view of in view of Kim. The Examiner takes the position that Shima discloses a printing apparatus that performs printing based on data acquired from a server on a network as claimed, with the exception of expressly determining whether access to the server is permitted based on access restriction information. Fan is cited as disclosing a registration device (memory) that registers access restriction information that is used to determine whether access should be granted. The Examiner also notes that Fan discusses allowing packets to pass in certain cases even though the source is not listed on the access control list. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the final rejection of the claims.

Applicant notes that Fan is directed to providing a firewall that provides security to a device to be accessed. Accordingly, at best, Fan would suggest providing a firewall in the network printer of Shima that would prevent unauthorized access to the network printer itself.

Such a combination, even if proper, is entirely different from the claimed invention. In the claimed invention, the printing apparatus receives a network address from the information processing apparatus. A determination is then made as to whether the printer can access the received network access or not. If the printer can, then the printer sends an outgoing access request to the server. If not, then the printer does not attempt to access the server, thereby avoiding unnecessary access requests to the server. In other words, the registering device, determination device and accessing device of the claimed invention are provided within the claimed printing apparatus and are used to determine whether the printing apparatus itself can access servers on the network. Thus, the claimed invention is both structurally and functionally different from any possible combination achieved by the cited references.

Applicant notes, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner is required to set forth sufficient reasoning as to how the combined teachings of the references would suggest the claimed invention. In this case, as clearly set forth above, even if the references could be properly combined, the resulting combination would at best suggest providing a firewall into the network printer of Shima, which would not result in the claimed invention. Absent of establishing a proper showing as to how all of the elements of the claimed invention would be reasonable suggested, the rejection is improper and cannot be maintained.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance, notice of which is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

23 DECEMBER 2008  
DATE

/Marc A. Rossi/  
MARC A. ROSSI  
REG. NO. 31,923

P.O. Box 826  
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826  
703-726-6020 (PHONE)  
703-726-6024 (FAX)